REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I.   Status of the Claims:

Claim 12 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

Claims 11, 13, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The amendments to some of the claims overcome the objections set forth by the Examiner.

Claims 1-11 and 13-20 are pending.

II.   Status of the Specification

The Abstract has been amended to correct informalities. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

III. Acknowledgment of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging that claims 7, 8, 12, 16 and 17 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 12 has been cancelled and its elements entered into claim 11. Thus, claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Claims 13-18 depend on claim 11 and are also allowable.

IV.   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,352,479 to Sparks, II ("*Sparks*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,018,736 to Pearson

et al. *("Pearson")*. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Sparks* in view of *Pearson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,080,064 to Pieterse et al. *("Pieterse")*[1]. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Comparing claim 1 to *Sparks* (US 6,352,476) and *Pearson* (US 5,018,736), the features of the invention according to claim 1 (hereinafter "the present invention") include a server apparatus comprising:

> a trading device for trading the points for any one of a plurality of unique datas, each of which is used uniquely in any one of the games; and
> a second sending device for sending the traded unique data,
> wherein one of said game machines each and said server comprises a converting device for converting play-information indicating the contents of user's playing in each game on each of said game machines into the points.

Because of the above features, by the converting device, a user may play a certain game and get some points according to the contents of the user's playing the game. Then, by the trading device and the second sending device, the user can obtain by using his/her points, the unique data for another game provided by the game system. Therefore, the user can obtain the unique data of a game A by the contents of the user's playing in another game B via the points. In other words, the contents of playing in the game B can influence the other game A.

Sparks discloses a game system where a user's personal data is stored in advance, at the moment when the user accesses a server, the server reviews the personal data of the user to display a list of available games as matched to the user (*Sparks,* col. 5, lines 5-28). Even if the point corresponds to the personal data in *Sparks* and the unique data corresponds to the games to be listed

---

[1] Applicants submit that claim 2 depends from claim 1 and an obviousness rejection should have at least the same references as presented in the independent claims.

for the user, *Sparks* fails to disclose and teach that the private data is obtained by the contents of the user's playing in a game. *Sparks* only discloses that the private data is obtained by an input from the user (*Sparks*, col. 4, lines 52-59). *Sparks* fails to disclose or suggest even a concept that the contents of user's playing one game influences the other game. Therefore, it is impossible to derive from Sparks the construction that the private data is obtained by the contents of the user's playing in a game.

Pearson discloses a game system where a user registers a plurality of sports players to his/her own team roster (*Pearson*, col. 10, lines 15-43), and the user can get points according to the performance of the registered players playing in a real game (*Pearson*, col. 10, lines 56-61). Accordingly, *Pearson* discloses a system where the user can get some points according to the performance of the real players' playing in a real game. The user can trade a player registered in his/her team roster for another player. However, this trading is not related to the points earned. The points in *Pearson* are not used for obtaining something, but used only for determining a winner (*Pearson*, col. 3, lines 58-62). *Pearson* fails to disclose or suggest that the points can be traded for something to be used in a game. Accordingly, it is apparent that the concept that the contents of the user's playing in a certain game influence another game is not derived from *Pearson*.

As mentioned above, both *Sparks* and *Pearson* fail to disclose or suggest the relation between games provided by the game system via the points. Therefore, even if *Sparks* and *Pearson* are combined, the result of the combination is only the game system where a user obtains points based on real sports games and the games for the user are listed based on the private data obtained

by the user's input. It is impossible to derive the above features from the combination, and the present invention is, therefore, in an allowable condition.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the elements of allowable claim 12, and is thus in condition for allowance. Similar to claim 11, claim 20 is directed to a method for a game system comprising "setting a trading value for said points which is unified throughout the plurality of games" and "trading said points for any one of a plurality of unique datas, each of said unique datas is used uniquely in any one of the plurality of games." Neither *Sparks* nor *Pearson* teach the possibility of having a point system that influences a plurality of game systems.

Comparing the invention according to claim 19 to *Sparks*, claim 19 is directed to a register terminal comprising:

> a readout device for reading out the individual identification-information from an information storage medium storing any one of the individual identification—information;
> an input device for inputting the common identification-information; and
> a sending device for sending the common identification-information input by said input device and the read out individual identification-information to said server.

By the sending device, the individual identification-information for identifying the user for each game together with the common identification-information input by the user are sent to the server. The server can then manage the individual identification-information in association with the common identification received together with the individual identification-information. Therefore, even if a plurality of individual identification-informations already exist, the plurality of individual identification-informations for one user can be associated with one common identification for the user.

Sparks and *Pearson* fail to disclose or suggest an identification-information set to identify a user for each game. Moreover, it is impossible to derive from *Sparks* and *Pearson*, a concept of a plurality of identification-informations corresponding to one user and associated with one common identification-information. Therefore, the above features to realize the concept are not derived from *Sparks* or *Pearson*.

Given the above, Applicants submit that claims 1, 19 and 20 are not taught or suggest by *Sparks* or *Pearson* and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 3-5, 9, 10, 13-15 and 18, they depend on claims 1 or 11 respectively and are allowable based on the arguments above.

Regarding claim 2, it depends on claim 1 and the arguments above regarding *Sparks* and *Pearson* are applicable. Further, *Pieterse* does not teach or suggest the elements missing from both *Sparks* and *Pearson*.

Thus, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below if the Examiner believes any issue can be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment.

Dated: July 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By
Louis J. DelJuidice
Registration No.: 47,522
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant